

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
WESTERN DIVISION**

CHARLES DERRELL SEALE

PLAINTIFF

VERSUS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:08CV105-P-A

**PHILIP MITCHELL, IN HIS INDIVIDUAL
CAPACITY**

DEFENDANT

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on the defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [39]. The Court, having reviewed the motion, the response, the briefs of the parties, the authorities cited and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, finds as follows, to-wit:

That there are genuine issues of material fact with regard to whether the defendant is entitled to qualified immunity. Accordingly, summary judgment is inappropriate. In ruling on a motion for summary judgment, the court is not to make credibility determinations, weigh evidence, or draw from the facts legitimate inferences for the movant. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986). Rather, the evidence of the nonmovant is to be believed, and all justifiable inferences are to be drawn in its favor. Id. at 255. The United States Supreme Court has granted the trial court some degree of flexibility when confronted with a summary judgment motion: "Neither do we suggest . . . that the trial court may not deny summary judgment in a case where there is reason to believe that the better course would be to proceed to a full trial." Id.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [39] is not well-taken and should be, and hereby is, DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this the 19th day of July, 2010.

/s/ W. Allen Pepper, Jr.
W. ALLEN PEPPER, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE